





# QEEG Clinical Report BrainLens V0.4

# Report Description

# Personal & Clinical Data


Name	Mehdi Naghibi	Date of Recording	03-Oct-2024				
Date of Birth - Age	13-Sep-1986 - 38.06	Gender	Male				
Handedness(R/L)	Right	Source of Referral	Dr Sadeghi				
Initial Diagnosis	Anger,Borderline Disorder,Psychosis						
Current Medication	Medication Free						

Dr Sadeghi





# Denoising Information (EC)



Number of Eye and Muscle Elements				Low Artifact Percentage				
Eye	2	Muscle	2	0				
Total Artifact Percentage				High Artifact Percentage				
()								
EEG Quality good		<b>Total Recording Time Remaining</b> 503.30 sec						





### Pathological assessment for mood disorders

### **Compare to Mood Disorders Database**












### **EEG Compatibility with Depression Diagnosis**

Depression Table		EC							
Feature Name	Threshold	Threshold Region							
Increased Global rAlp	ha 0.50	0.50 global							
Increased global rThe	eta 0.00	0.00 NAN							
Decreased rDelta	-0.50	RF-MF-LT-RT-C-P-O-							
Increased rBeta	0.00	NAN							
Left FAA	-0.07	Left FAA							
Right OAA	0.00	NAN							
Decreased Coherence (D	,T) -0.50	Decreased Coherence (D,T)							
Increased Coherence (A	B) 0.00	NAN							
depression 0	1 1 1 1 10 20	30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100  Depression Compatibility							
Depression Probability									

# **EEG Compatibility with Anxiety Diagnosis**







### EEG Compatibility with Mood Swings Diagnosis \*

Mood S	iwings Table	EC									
Feat	ure Name	Threshold	Threshold Region								
Decrea	sed rAlpha	0.00	0.00 NAN								
Increased	(rDelta+rTheta)	0.00	00 NAN								
Increa	sed rBeta	0.00	NAN								
Decreased A	Alpha Coherence	-0.50	-0.50 Decreased Alpha Coherence								
Rig	ht FAA	0.00		NAN							
вмі	0 10	20	30	40 Mood S	50 Swing Compa	60 atibility	1 70	I 80	90	100	
Mood Swings Probability											

\* This index can only be investigated if there are symptoms of mood swings (R/O BMD or R/O mood swings).

# Cognitive Functions

## Arousal Level Detection










### •QEEG based predicting medication response



Effect Size

### **Explanation**



#### Medication Recommendation

These two tables can be considered the most important finding that can be extracted from QEEG. To prepare this list, the NPCIndex Article Review Team has studied, categorized, and extracted algorithms from many authoritative published articles on predict medication response and Pharmaco EEG studies. These articles are published between 1970 and 2021. The findings extracted from this set include 85 different factors in the raw band domains, spectrum, power, coherence, and loreta that have not been segregated to avoid complexity, and their results are shown in these diagrams. One can review details in NPCIndex.com.

These two charts, calculate response probability to various medications, according only to QEEG indicators. Blue charts favor drug response and red charts favor drug resistance. The longer the bar, the more evidence there is in the articles. Only drugs listed in the articles are listed. These tables present the indicators reviewed in the QEEG studies and are not a substitute for physician selection.






### rTMS Response Prediction


#### Network Performance

Accuracy: 92.1% Sensitivity: 89.13% Specificity: 97.47%


#### Participants Information




#### Features Information



#### Responsibility



#### Data Distribution




#### About Predicting rTMS Response

This index was obtained based on machine learning approaches and by examining the QEEG biomarkers of more than 470 cases treated with rTMS. The cases were diagnosed with depression (with and without comorbidity) and all were medication free. By examining more than 40 biomarkers capable of predicting response to rTMS treatment in previous studies and with data analysis, finally 10 biomarkers including bispectral and nonlinear features entered the machine learning process. The final chart can distinguish between RTMS responsive and resistant cases with 92.1% accuracy. This difference rate is much higher than the average response to treatment of 44%, in the selection of patients with clinical criteria, and is an important finding in the direction of personalized treatment for rTMS.






# Alpha Asymmetry(AA)



# APF(EC)





Frontal APF= 11.00


Posterior APF= 10.88

# Absolute Power-Eye Closed (EC) 🥟














### Relative Power-Eye Closed (EC) 🌮


















### Z Score Summary Information (EC)





### E.C.T/B Ratio ( Raw- Z Score)





# EEG Spectra





### Arousal Level

